

Alternative Interpretation of the Tevatron Top Events

Darwin Chang, We-Fu Chang

*NCTS and Department of Physics,
National Tsing-Hua University
Hsinchu 30043, Taiwan, Republic of China*

Ernest Ma

*Department of Physics, University of California
Riverside, California 92521, USA*

Abstract

We propose an alternative interpretation of the top events discovered at the Tevatron in 1995. Given that the charge of the b quark jet cannot be measured for the whole sample with certainty, the signal can be due to a quark of charge $-4/3$ at the reported mass, *i.e.* 174 GeV, while the top quark is actually heavier, say above 230 GeV. We point out in this paper that such a scenario is actually hinted at by the latest precision electroweak measurements of Z decay. To rule out this possibility in the future, the b quark jet charge analysis has to become definitive, or the single "top" production cross section has to be measured.

It is generally believed that the top quark was discovered at Fermilab in 1995. [1, 2] Its decay into a W boson and a b quark is an unmistakable signature. However, unless the correlation between the charge of the W boson and the charge of the b quark jet can be measured with certainty, [3] the “top quark” events may be either W^+b or W^-b . If they are the former, then their identification as the decay product of t from the expected $(t, b)_L$ doublet of the standard model is certainly justified. If the latter, then an exotic quark of charge $-4/3$ is implied. Of course, such a scenario appears to be totally unmotivated – that is, until now. The updated precision measurements of electroweak parameters at the e^+e^- colliders LEP at CERN and SLC at SLAC reveal in fact an intriguing possibility that m_t may be larger than about 230 GeV, and that the right-handed coupling of the b quark to the Z boson may be significantly modified.

In this paper we analyze the 1998 precision electroweak data using the parameters $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ and ϵ_b , [4] but also allow b_R to mix with an exotic quark Q_1 of charge $-1/3$ as part of the doublet $(Q_1, Q_4)_R$, where Q_4 has charge $-4/3$. [5, 6] We discuss how the current data [7] favor such an interpretation. We then propose an exotic fourth family of quarks and leptons which is free of anomalies, together with a heavy Higgs scalar triplet [8] which supplies the neutrinos with Majorana masses. We show that this model accounts for all the data, including the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ rate and forward-backward asymmetry. [9] It has also an easily testable prediction in the single production of Q_4 .

The phenomenological success of the standard gauge model of particle interactions is indisputable. It is being tested experimentally at the one-loop level in terms of its calculable radiative corrections. Consider the $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ variables [10] which are purely weak radiative corrections to the two-point self-energy functions of the W and Z bosons. They are defined in such a way that they are zero in the standard-model tree approximation, keeping however the electromagnetic and strong-interaction radiative corrections. Using as inputs the Fermi

constant, G_F , the mass of the Z boson, m_Z , and the electromagnetic fine-structure constant extrapolated to the Z mass, $\alpha(m_Z)$, the $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ variables can be determined from the experimental measurements of the partial width and forward-backward asymmetry of the decay of Z to charged lepton pairs, and the mass of the W boson, m_W .

Assuming lepton universality, the $Z \rightarrow l^- l^+$ partial width and forward-backward asymmetry are given by [4]

$$\Gamma_l = \frac{G_F m_Z^3}{6\pi\sqrt{2}} (g_V^2 + g_A^2) \left(1 + \frac{3\alpha}{4\pi}\right), \quad (1)$$

$$A_l^{FB}(\sqrt{s} = m_Z) = \frac{3g_V^2 g_A^2}{(g_V^2 + g_A^2)^2}, \quad (2)$$

where

$$g_A = -\frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}\right), \quad (3)$$

$$g_V = -\frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}\right) (1 - 4\sin^2 \theta_{eff}). \quad (4)$$

In addition, s_0^2 (with $c_0^2 \equiv 1 - s_0^2$) is defined by

$$s_0^2 c_0^2 \equiv \frac{\pi\alpha(m_Z)}{\sqrt{2}G_F m_Z^2}, \quad (5)$$

and $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}$ is related to s_0^2 by

$$\frac{\sin^2 \theta_{eff}}{s_0^2} = 1 + \frac{\epsilon_3 - c_0^2 \epsilon_1}{c_0^2 - s_0^2}. \quad (6)$$

With $\alpha(m_Z)^{-1} = 128.90$, it has been shown that [4]

$$\Gamma_l = 83.563 \text{ MeV} (1 + 1.20\epsilon_1 - 0.26\epsilon_3), \quad (7)$$

and

$$A_l^{FB} = 0.01696 (1 + 34.72\epsilon_1 - 45.15\epsilon_3). \quad (8)$$

Given the latest experimental values [7]

$$\Gamma_l = 83.90 \pm 0.10 \text{ MeV}, \quad (9)$$

and

$$A_t^{FB} = 0.01683 \pm 0.00096, \quad (10)$$

we find

$$\epsilon_1 = (4.1 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-3}, \quad (11)$$

$$\epsilon_3 = (3.3 \pm 1.8) \times 10^{-3}. \quad (12)$$

Using [4]

$$m_W^2/m_Z^2 = 0.768905 (1 + 1.43\epsilon_1 - 1.00\epsilon_2 - 0.86\epsilon_3), \quad (13)$$

and the latest experimental values [7]

$$m_W = 80.39 \pm 0.06 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_Z = 91.1867 \pm 0.0021 \text{ GeV}, \quad (14)$$

with Eqs.(11) and (12), we find

$$\epsilon_2 = (-7.8 \pm 2.8) \times 10^{-3}. \quad (15)$$

The above values for $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ agree very well with those obtained a year ago [4] based on earlier data. [11] They are also very consistent with the Tevatron determination of $m_t = 173.8 \pm 5.0$ GeV. Clearly there is no discrepancy with the standard model as far as leptons are concerned.

Consider now $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ decay. There are 3 measured quantities: the partial width divided by the hadronic width, R_b , by both LEP and SLC, the forward-backward asymmetry at the Z pole, $A_{FB}^{0,b}$, by LEP, and the left-right asymmetry, A_b , by SLC. Theoretically, this process differs from all others by the important fact that the t quark contributes to the vertex correction through the expected $(t, b)_L$ doublet, whereas $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ contributes universally to all Z decays. The effective left-handed and right-handed couplings of the b quark to the Z boson are given in the standard model by

$$g_{bL} = \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}\right) \left[-\frac{1}{2}(1 + \epsilon_b) + \frac{1}{3} \sin^2 \theta_{eff}\right], \quad (16)$$

$$g_{bR} = \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}\right) \frac{1}{3} \sin^2 \theta_{eff}. \quad (17)$$

Note that the t quark contributes to only g_{bL} through ϵ_b . Several years ago when there was a large experimental R_b excess, many theoretical attempts were made to increase the magnitude of g_{bL} by postulating new contributions to ϵ_b , whereas g_{bR} was left untouched. At that time, the measurement errors of $A_{FB}^{0,b}$ and A_b were large enough so that the above approach was justified. However, since about a year ago, there has been a small but theoretically very important shift in the data. R_b is now just one standard deviation above the theoretical prediction, but both $A_{FB}^{0,b}$ and A_b are two standard deviations below. Since the former is proportional to $g_{bL}^2 + g_{bR}^2$ and the latter are proportional to $g_{bL}^2 - g_{bR}^2$, this turns out to imply that [9] the magnitude of g_{bL} is actually smaller than the theoretical prediction and that of g_{bR} is much greater. Hence an intriguing possibility exists that the shift of g_{bL} is due to a much larger m_t and that the shift of g_{bR} is due to the mixing of b_R with a heavy quark doublet $(Q_1, Q_4)_R$, where Q_4 has charge $-4/3$, [5, 6] and its decay into W^-b at the Tevatron was observed and assumed to be $W^- \bar{b}$ from $\bar{t}$.

From the latest experimental values [7]

$$R_b = 0.21656 \pm 0.00074, \quad A_{FB}^{0,b} = 0.0991 \pm 0.0021, \quad A_b = 0.856 \pm 0.036, \quad (18)$$

the couplings g_{bL} and g_{bR} have been determined: [9]

$$g_{bL} = -0.4159 \pm 0.0024, \quad g_{bR} = 0.1050 \pm 0.0090. \quad (19)$$

Using $m_t = 174$ GeV, $m_H = 100$ GeV, and $\sin^2 \theta_{eff} = 0.23125 \pm 0.00023$, [12] the standard model yields [9]

$$g_{bL}^{SM} = -0.4208, \quad g_{bR}^{SM} = 0.0774. \quad (20)$$

From Fig. 2 of Ref. [9], it is seen that the standard-model point is just outside the 99% confidence-level contour of the data. From g_{bL} , we now find

$$\epsilon_b = (-15.7 \pm 4.9) \times 10^{-3}. \quad (21)$$

This is a dramatically new result. Previous analyses force a fit to both R_b and the asymmetries with ϵ_b , but since g_{bR} cannot be changed, the former tends to increase g_{bL} and the latter tend to decrease it. The end result is a much smaller magnitude for ϵ_b which is consistent with $m_t = 174$ GeV. Now from Eq.(21), we obtain

$$m_t = 274_{-47}^{+40} \text{ GeV}, \quad (22)$$

where we have approximated ϵ_b by its leading contribution, $-G_F m_t^2 / 4\pi^2 \sqrt{2}$.

Next we change g_{bR} by mixing b ($I_{3R} = 0$) with a heavy quark Q_1 of $I_{3R} = 1/2$. [5, 6] We then have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{bR} &= \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}\right) \left[\frac{1}{3} \sin^2 \theta_{eff} \cos^2 \theta_b + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} \sin^2 \theta_{eff}\right) \sin^2 \theta_b \right] \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon_1}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{3} \sin^2 \theta_{eff} + \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 \theta_b \right). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Using Eq.(19), we find

$$\sin^2 \theta_b = 0.0554 \pm 0.0180. \quad (24)$$

To be more specific, we propose an exotic fourth family of quarks and leptons. The b_R singlet of the standard model becomes

$$b_R \cos \theta_b - Q_{1R} \sin \theta_b \sim (3, 1, -1/3), \quad (25)$$

where its $SU(3)_C \times SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$ representation content is also displayed. We then add

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q_1 \cos \theta_b + b \sin \theta_b \\ Q_4 \end{bmatrix}_R \sim \left(3, 2, -\frac{5}{6}\right), \quad (26)$$

$$Q_{1L} \sim (3, 1, -1/3), \quad Q_{4L} \sim (3, 1, -4/3), \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} L_3 \\ L_2 \end{bmatrix}_R \sim \left(1, 2, \frac{5}{2}\right), \quad \begin{matrix} L_{3L} \sim (1, 1, 3), \\ L_{2L} \sim (1, 1, 2). \end{matrix} \quad (28)$$

Anomalies cancel in the above because $Y_L = -3Y_Q$ as in the standard model. Within this model, Eq.(16) and Eq.(23) are valid to good accuracy with ϵ_b again due to the top loop. In

the following, we will take $m_4 = 174$ GeV for Q_4 to account for the Tevatron “top” events, and the true m_t will be chosen to be higher, say about 230 GeV, to be consistent with Eq.(22).

We now calculate the extra contributions of the exotic fourth family of our model (relative to the standard model with $m_t = 174$ GeV) to the variables $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$. [13] First,

$$\Delta\epsilon_3 = \frac{\alpha}{24\pi s_0^2} \left(3 + 5 \ln \frac{m_1^2}{m_4^2} + 1 - 5 \ln \frac{m_3^2}{m_2^2} - \ln \left[\frac{m_t}{174 \text{ GeV}} \right]^2 \right). \quad (29)$$

For illustration, let $m_1 = 200$ GeV, $m_2 = 100$ GeV, $m_3 = 200$ GeV, then $\Delta\epsilon_3 = -0.93 \times 10^{-3}$, which is in fact a better fit to the present data. For heavier top mass, the fit improves even more (*e.g.* for $m_t = 274$ GeV, $\Delta\epsilon_3 = -1.09 \times 10^{-3}$). Note that the above values are chosen so that the processes $e^-e^+ \rightarrow L_2^-L_2^{++}$ and $Q_1\bar{b} + b\bar{Q}_1$ are currently kinematically forbidden.

Second,

$$\Delta\epsilon_2 = -\frac{\alpha}{24\pi s_0^2} \left(3g(m_1^2, m_4^2) + g(m_3^2, m_2^2) + 3 \ln \left[\frac{m_t}{174 \text{ GeV}} \right]^2 \right), \quad (30)$$

where

$$g(x, y) = -\frac{5}{3} + \frac{4xy}{(x-y)^2} + \frac{(x+y)(x^2 - 4xy + y^2)}{(x-y)^3} \ln \frac{x}{y}. \quad (31)$$

For the same sample values, we obtain $\Delta\epsilon_2 = -0.92 \times 10^{-3}$, which is again a better fit to the present data. Third,

$$\Delta\epsilon_1 = \frac{\alpha}{16\pi s_0^2 c_0^2 m_Z^2} \left(3f(m_1^2, m_4^2) + f(m_3^2, m_2^2) + 3[m_t^2 - (174 \text{ GeV})^2] \right), \quad (32)$$

where

$$f(x, y) = x + y - \frac{2xy}{x-y} \ln \frac{x}{y}. \quad (33)$$

For the same sample values, we obtain $\Delta\epsilon_1 = 8.7 \times 10^{-3}$, which is of course a disaster. To fit present data, we need another source of ϵ_1 which gives, say, -9×10^{-3} . Fortunately, there is already such a source in the form of a heavy Higgs scalar triplet [8]

$$\xi \equiv (\xi^{++}, \xi^+, \xi^0) \sim (1, 3, 1), \quad (34)$$

which allows the standard-model neutrinos to acquire Majorana masses. After all, there is now a good deal of experimental evidence for neutrino oscillations and the minimal standard model should be extended to include nonzero neutrino masses. [14] Let ξ^0 acquire a nonzero vacuum expectation value u in addition to the standard-model Higgs doublet $\langle\phi^0\rangle = v$, then in the tree approximation,

$$\left[\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\right]_{CC} = \frac{1}{4v^2 + 8u^2}, \quad \left[\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\right]_{NC} = \frac{1}{4v^2 + 16u^2}, \quad (35)$$

where CC denotes charged current and NC denotes neutral current. The contribution to ϵ_1 is thus $-2u^2/(v^2 + 4u^2)$ and for $u = 12$ GeV, the desired shift is obtained. This value of u also implies that m_ξ can be rather large. Using the relationship [8]

$$u \simeq -\mu v^2/m_\xi^2, \quad (36)$$

and setting the trilinear coupling μ of $\xi^\dagger\phi\phi$ equal to m_ξ , we obtain $m_\xi = 2.6$ TeV. This in turn implies that the one-loop contributions of ξ to $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ should be negligible. To check this, we have calculated the shifts of $\epsilon_{1,2,3}$ due to ξ . Both ϵ_3 and ϵ_2 are corrected by $-\alpha/(12\pi s_0^2)$ times a factor of order v^2/m_ξ^2 . Hence these contributions are of order 10^{-5} . In the case of ϵ_1 , we find the leading contribution to be

$$\Delta\epsilon_1 = \frac{\alpha}{4\pi s_0^2 c_0^2 m_Z^2} (m_{++}^2 - 2m_+^2 + m_0^2), \quad (37)$$

but this is zero because the sum rule $m_{++}^2 - m_+^2 = m_+^2 - m_0^2$ is valid [15] in the approximation that the mass differences in ξ are only due to scalar doublets. We estimate the next term to be at most of order 10^{-5} to 10^{-4} .

Crucial tests of the Q_4 hypothesis. The unambiguous method is to distinguish a b jet from a $\bar{b}$ jet by its charge, if it can be done with certainty. [3] A potentially easier way is to measure the single "top" production cross section [16] in the future Run II of the Tevatron scheduled to begin in 2000. Comparing it against the $t\bar{t}$ cross section would determine $|V_{tb}|^2$.

If it turns out to be given by Eq. (24) and not unity as expected in the standard model, it would be an indication that the top events may be due to Q_4 . On the other hand, it may accidentally be so because there is a heavier but ordinary fourth family of quarks, *i.e.* $(t', b')_L$, t'_R , and b'_R . In any case, if the single “top” production cross section is actually only a few percent of its expected value, the number of events may be too small to be observed above background.

In conclusion, we point out in this paper that the top events may be due to a heavy quark of charge $-4/3$ instead of $2/3$. This would come about if m_t is actually much larger than 174 GeV, and b_L or b_R mixes with a heavy quark Q_1 of charge $-1/3$ whose doublet partner Q_4 has charge $-4/3$. In particular, the case with b_R mixing with $(Q_1, Q_4)_R$ can result in a better fit of the present data on R_b , $A_{FB}^{0,b}$, and A_b than the standard model. The same fit also favors $m_t > 230$ GeV. As discussed in the previous paragraph, this hypothesis will be tested in the future Run II of the Tevatron.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank C.-Q. Geng for discussion of anomaly, and G.-P. Yeh, M.-J. Wang, and G. Velev for discussions on CDF physics. EM is supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG03-94ER40837; DC and WFC are supported by a grant from the National Science Council of ROC.

APPENDIX

Our model of an exotic fourth family naturally has a softly broken discrete Z_2 symmetry, under which all the exotic fermions are odd and the ordinary ones are even. It is broken only by the explicit soft term $m'\bar{Q}_{1L}b_R$. Hence the 2×2 mass matrix linking $(\bar{b}_L, \bar{Q}_{1L})$ with (b_R, Q_{1R}) is given by

$$\mathcal{M}_{bQ_1} = \begin{bmatrix} m_b & 0 \\ m' & m_1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (38)$$

Thus $\sin \theta_b \simeq m'/m_1$ and m' can be small naturally because it breaks this discrete Z_2 symmetry.

References

- [1] F. Abe *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2626 (1995).
- [2] S. Abachi *et al.* (D0 Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2632 (1995).
- [3] A preliminary jet-charge analysis has been applied to a few events in the CDF sample and it appears to favor the standard (*i.e.* top) interpretation. However, it is not clear whether a definitive result will become available before Run II.
- [4] For a recent review, see for example G. Altarelli, R. Barbieri, and F. Caravaglios, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A13**, 1031 (1998).
- [5] C.-H. V. Chang, D. Chang, and W.-Y. Keung, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 7051 (1996).
- [6] D. Chang and E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 097301 (1998).
- [7] D. Karlen, in Proceedings of the XXIX International Conference on High Energy Physics, Vancouver, Canada (July 1998).

- [8] E. Ma and U. Sarkar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5716 (1998).
- [9] J. H. Field, hep-ph/9809292.
- [10] G. Altarelli, R. Barbieri, and S. Jadach, Nucl. Phys. **B369**, 3 (1992); **B376**, 444 (1992);
G. Altarelli, R. Barbieri, and F. Caravaglios, Nucl. Phys. **B403**, 3 (1993); Phys. Lett.
B349, 145 (1995).
- [11] The LEP Collaboration *et al.*, CERN-PPE/97-154 (Dec 97).
- [12] With this value of $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}$ from leptonic data alone, the LEP and SLC measurements [7] are only $+0.85\sigma$ and -0.77σ away, instead of $+0.54\sigma$ and -1.78σ if the $b\bar{b}$ data are included.
- [13] C. D. Froggatt, R. G. Moorhouse, and I. G. Knowles, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 2471 (1992).
- [14] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1171 (1998).
- [15] L. Lavoura and L.-F. Li, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 1409 (1994).
- [16] A. P. Heinson, A. S. Belyaev, and E. E. Boos, Phys. Rev. **D56**, 3114 (1997).